

sible for you in the face of what I have said and written on that subject successfully to mislead even yourself, much less the people of Ontario, and I leave the matter, therefore, with this single observation, that nothing in my judgment is more likely to bring about an agitation for such constitutional changes as may be necessary to permit the abolition of separate schools than the extraordinary pretensions put forward by the hierarchy in certain places with regard to their right to control them, and the intemperate utterance of such too zealous champions as your Grace has proved yourself so often to be. Depend upon it those whose cause you champion will not thank you for the aspersions you put on their country and their loyalty to it when you suggest that though their material interests would be served by annexation to the neighboring republic they are restrained from advocating annexation by a consideration of the advantages with regard to separate schools which they enjoy in Canada. They have, I doubt not, a higher opinion of their country than your Grace seems to entertain, and they will not, I venture to think, thank you for the suggestion that the continuance of their allegiance to it depends upon their retaining the rights they now enjoy with regard to education. Be assured, too, that the covert threat to the majority in Ontario, which the statements to which I have adverted contain, will not deter them from pursuing that course which they believe to be best calculated to advance their country's interest. Inow part from your Grace, congratulating myself on the absolute justice of the principles which I advocate, which stands confessed when you are unable to attack me for any position which I have actually taken, and are compelled to resort to a very vivid imagination for your facts, and having called it to your aid, to a most copious vocabulary for the denunciation of the image you have set up.

I have the honor to be,

Your Grace's chedient servant,

W. R. MEREDITH,

The Most Reverend the Archbishop (elect)  
of the Diocese of Kingston, Kingston,  
Ontario.

#### Another Vigorous Letter From His Grace.

To William R. Meredith, Esq., Q.C., M.P.P.;

DEAR SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter published in Friday's issue of *The Empire*. Whilst I experience no small share of satisfaction at your prudent resolve to lay down your arms, I do not forego my right, as complainant against you in the court of public opinion,

to "sum up" the case before I allow you to part from me.

My complaint was that you had publicly attributed to me the authorship of a sentence extracted by you from a Kingston newspaper, which you were pleased to interpret to your auditors as revealing a great danger to the state—"one of the dangers of modern civilization"—"one of the greatest evils we have to contend with parliamentary government" and "against which both parties should cry 'Unite, unite against a common enemy.'" In your reply you asked me to believe that you did not impute the authorship of that sentence to me, inasmuch as *The Empire's* report was "verbally" incorrect in making you appear to say, "The words are used by a newspaper, but to some extent, I apprehend, by the gentleman who presides over the archiepiscopal See of Kingston." I honorably accepted your assurance; and, on your further explanation that you had merely hazarded a conjecture as to my responsibility in the matter, I allowed your imputation to stand as "conjecture and no more." Accordingly I challenged you to justify your public utterance of this "conjecture," declaring it "illogical, unjust and illegal." You made no defence of any kind; and, in view of my counter statement and argument, you abandoned your original charge altogether, never referring to it in any of your subsequent letters; thus you virtually pleaded guilty to an indefensible and unjustifiable attack upon me before my fellow-citizens throughout the province. Pardon me, sir, if I venture to say that according to the laws of honor you are bound to make me an adequate apology.

In your first letter to me (dated December 19) you claimed that I should have censured the newspaper to which you were pleased to attach a most odious meaning, and in each of your subsequent rejoinders you have insisted that I am bound "to approve or disapprove" that sentence, as interpreted by you. Your patron and inspirer, the *Toronto Mail*, and all the small anti-Catholic local sheets that take their cue each morning from its editor joined in full chorus with your demand. Ye seem to have had a previous agreement about it. Now, sir, an all-sufficient reply to you would be, that it is not the practice among gentlemen to answer impertinent questions, more especially when they have been capriciously contrived. But I prefer to deal with you as a lawyer. Having had the advantage of thirty years' study of law and ten years' practice in the judicial application of its principles and methods, I take exquisite pleasure in probing your legal mind and analyzing its operations.